

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-22, 30, 38 and 41-42 were previously canceled.

Claims 23, 25, 27, 29, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 39 are currently being amended.

Claims 43 -46 are new.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 23-29, 31-37, 39, 40, and 43 -46 (20 claims) are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page two of the office action, the Examiner has rejected claims 23-29, 31-37, 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Emery et al (USPN: 5,758,281).

Emery discloses a “personal communication service using wireline/wireless configuration”. Emery requires “centralized control processing by both telephone central office switching systems and wireless mobility controllers based on a call processing data associated with individual subscribers stored in a central service control point . . . within the telephone network” (see col. 7, lines 65-67 – col. 8, lines 1-4).

Independent Claim 23.

Claim 23 is in independent form and recites a “method for switching a subscriber station, from a first telecommunications network to a second telecommunications network” comprising, in combination with other elements,

“providing a first telecommunications network with a first local exchange, a second telecommunications network with a second local exchange, a subscriber station, a primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and a primary routing information in the second telecommunications network, said first telecommunication network being connected to said second telecommunication network via a connection point wherein the two telecommunication networks are interconnected, said subscriber station involved in a change between the two telecommunications networks, said subscriber station initially connected to said first local exchange, not a mobile switching center, said primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and primary routing information in the second telecommunications network pertaining to said subscriber station, said primary routing information for defining a connection set up from the respective telecommunications network to the first local exchange”.

“disconnecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station from the first local exchange;” and

“connecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station to the second local exchange.”

Claims 24-29, 31, 43 and 45 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 23.

Emery does not disclose a “method for switching a subscriber station from a first telecommunications network to a second telecommunications network” comprising, among other elements,

“providing a first telecommunications network with a first local exchange, a second telecommunications network with a second local exchange, a subscriber station, a primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and a primary routing information in the second telecommunications network, said first telecommunication network being connected to said second telecommunication network via a connection point wherein the two telecommunication networks are interconnected, said subscriber station involved in a change between the two telecommunications networks, said subscriber station initially connected to said first local exchange, not a mobile switching center, said primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and primary routing information in the second telecommunications network pertaining to said subscriber station, said primary routing information for defining a connection set up from the respective telecommunications network to the first local exchange”.

“disconnecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station from the first local exchange;” and

“connecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station to the second local exchange.”

as recited in independent Claim 23, as amended. The rejection of Claim 23, as amended, over Emery is improper. Claim 23, as amended, is patentable over Emery.

Support for the amendment to independent Claim 23 can be found in the specification at least on page 1, line 24, page 2, lines 6-16, page 16, lines 12-20, page 21, lines 4-10, and page 28, lines 10-13, and Fig. 1

Support for the amendment to Claim 25 can be found in the specification at least on page 5, lines 3-13 and Fig. 1, and page 17, line 17 to page 18, line 3.

The amendments to Claims 27 and 29 correct clerical errors and clarify the substance of the claims.

As disclosed and claimed in the present application, there is no shared routing information with respect to the subscriber in both the first and second networks. Initially, calls to the subscriber station, which is not a mobile switching center, is routed by the first network based on stored primary routing information to the first local exchange and the second network, based on stored primary routing information routes the call to the connection point. The switching of the subscriber station requires disconnecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station from the first local exchange and connecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station to the second local exchange in the second network.

In contrast, Emery relies on a mobile switching center NOT a local exchange. The Examiner cites VLR at 22 in Fig. 2 of Emery as being a local exchange. The Applicant traverses such characterization, and submits that the Visited Location Register (number 22 in Fig. 2) is an element of a mobile network (see col. 11, lines 45-50 of Emery) and not a local exchange. A “local exchange,” as is understood by one ordinarily skilled in the art, is a switching system of a fixed network, not a mobile network. Further, the second telecommunication network cited by the Examiner at col. 15, lines 20-35 of Emery is for a “mobile communication” system.

The Applicant submits that the Examiner’s citations to Emery relate to a mobile network not a fixed local exchange as described and claimed in the present application. For example, the Examiner cites element 31 in Fig. 2 of Emery as a “connection point.” However, element 31 is a signal transfer point and does not connect the transfer payload (voice data). The “connection point,” as understood by one ordinarily skilled in the art, as disclosed and claimed in the present application interconnects the first and second network with respect to signaling and payload (voice data). When the subscriber of the present application is disconnected from the first network and connected to the second network, both the signaling and payload (voice data) have to transfer to the second network through the connection point. Emery does not teach or suggest such connection point. Emery discloses mobile communications and mobile elements, such as a radio link system (see col. 4, lines 45-67 and col. 5, lines 1-22).

Accordingly, Emery does not anticipate that which is disclosed and claimed in the present application since Emery does not have a local exchange or a connection point as required in independent claim 23.

Dependent claims 24-29, 31, 43 and 45 which depend from independent claim 23, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph four.

Independent claim 32.

Claim 32 is in independent form and recites “the method for switching a subscriber station from a first telecommunications network to a second telecommunications network”, comprising, in combination with other elements,

“providing a first telecommunications network with a first local exchange, a second telecommunications network with a second local exchange, a subscriber station, a primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and a primary routing information in the second telecommunications network;”

“said first telecommunication network being connected to said second telecommunication network via a connection point wherein the two telecommunication networks are interconnected;”

“said subscriber station involved in a change between the two telecommunications networks said subscriber station initially connected to said first local exchange, not a mobile switching center, said primary routing information is the first telecommunications network and primary routing information in the second telecommunications network pertaining to said subscriber station, said primary routing information for defining a connection setup from the respective telecommunications network to the first local exchange;”

“disconnecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station from the first local exchange;” and

“connecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station to the second local exchange”.

Claims 33-37, 39-40, 44 and 46 depend from independent claim 32, as amended.

Emery does not disclose a “method for switching a subscriber station from a first telecommunication network to a second telecommunication network,” comprising, together with other elements, “providing a first telecommunications network with a first local exchange, a second telecommunications network with a second local exchange, a subscriber station, a primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and a primary routing information in the second telecommunications network;”

“said first telecommunication network being connected to said second telecommunication network via a connection point wherein the two telecommunication networks are interconnected;”

“said subscriber station involved in a change between the two telecommunications networks said subscriber station initially connected to said first local exchange, not a mobile switching center, said primary routing information in the first telecommunications network and primary routing information in the second telecommunications network pertaining to said subscriber station, said primary routing information for defining a connection setup from the respective telecommunications network to the first local exchange;”

“disconnecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station from the first local exchange;” and

“connecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station to the second local exchange”.

as recited in independent claim 32, as amended. The rejection of claim 32, as amended over Emery is improper. Claim 32, as amended is patentable over Emery.

Support for the amendment to independent claim 32 can be found at least in specification page 1, line 24, page 2, lines 6-16, page 16, lines 12-20, page 21, lines 4-10 and page 28, lines 10-13, and Fig. 1.

Support for the amendment to claim 33 can be found in the specification at least on page 5, lines 3-13 and Fig. 1, and page 17, lines 17 to page 18, line 3.

Support for the amendment to Claim 39 can be found in the specification, at least on page 6, lines 22-25, page 8, lines 18- 21, page 9, line 21 to page 10, line 16.

The amendments to claims 34, 35, and 37 correct clerical errors and clarify the substance of the claims.

New claims 43-46 are restatements of previously submitted claims 41-42.

As disclosed and claimed in the present application, there is no shared routing information with respect to the subscriber in both the first and second networks. Initially, calls to the subscriber station, which is not a mobile switching center, is routed by the first network based on stored primary routing information to the first local exchange and the second network, based on stored primary routing information routes the call to the connection point. The switching of the subscriber station requires disconnecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station from the first local exchange and connecting electrically the subscriber line of the subscriber station to the second local exchange in the second network.

In contrast, Emery relies on a mobile switching center NOT a local exchange. The Examiner cites VLR at 22 in Fig. 2 of Emery as being a local exchange. The Applicant traverses such characterization, and submits that the Visited Location Register (number 22 in Fig. 2) is an element of a mobile network (see col. 11, lines 45-50 of Emery) and not a local exchange. A “local exchange,” as is understood by one ordinarily skilled in the art, is a switching system of a fixed network, not a mobile network. Further, the second telecommunication network cited by the Examiner at col. 15, lines 20-35 of Emery is for a “mobile communication” system.

The Applicant submits that the Examiner's citations to Emery relate to a mobile network not a fixed local exchange as described and claimed in the present application. For example, the Examiner cites element 31 in Fig. 2 of Emery as a "connection point." However, element 31 is a signal transfer point and does not connect the transfer payload (voice data). The "connection point," as understood by one ordinarily skilled in the art, as disclosed and claimed in the present application interconnects the first and second network with respect to signaling and payload (voice data). When the subscriber of the present application is disconnected from the first network and connected to the second network, both the signaling and payload (voice data) have to transfer to the second network through the connection point. Emery does not teach or suggest such connection point. Emery discloses mobile communications and mobile elements, such as a radio link system (see col. 4, lines 45-67 and col. 5, lines 1-22).

Accordingly, Emery does not anticipate that which is disclosed and claimed in the present application since Emery does not have a local exchange or a connection point as required in independent claim 32.

Dependent claims 33-37, 39-40, 44 and 46 which depend from independent claim 32 are also patentable.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 23-29, 31-37 and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.


The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 11-16-07

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5776
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

By


James A. Wilke
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 34,279